



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/787,105 | 01/17/2002 | Kenji Hatada | 360842007400 | 1303 |

7590 09/12/2003

Barry E Bretschneider
Morrison & Foerster
2000 Pennsylvania Avenue N W
Washington, DC 20006-1888

EXAMINER

KRUER, KEVIN R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1773

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/787,105

Applicant(s)

HATADA, KENJI

Examiner

Kevin R Kruer

Art Unit

1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,5 and 7-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,5,7-11 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 20, 2003 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-11, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mokerji (US 6,096,426) in view of Takemura et al (US 4,763,133). Mokerji teaches a multi-layer coating comprising a polymeric layer deposited on the surface of the article, a chrome/nickel alloy layer deposited on the polymeric layer and a protective acrylic layer deposited on the alloy layer (abstract). The alloy layer is deposited on the plastic layer by any conventional and well-known technique such as vapor deposition, electroplating, and the like (col 2, lines 63+). The acrylic layer provides the laminate with weather resistance (col 3, lines 57+).

Mokerji does not teach that the reflector should be coated with the claimed polymer resin layer. However, Takemura teaches that industrial paints are widely applied to metals deposited layers in order to provide the metal with improved weather resistance (col 4, lines 64+). Industrial paints include (a) an alkyd resins and (b) polyurethane, and (c) acrylic paints. Alkyd resins are prepared by condensation of polybasic acids and polyhydric alcohols (col 6, lines 4+), including those prepared by modifications using vegetable oils such as linseed oil, tung oil, castor oil, sunflower oil, soybean oil, and coconut oil can be used. Available two-component polyurethane paints are prepared by reacting dry oils (e.g., soybean oils, linseed oils, or castor oils) with a polyester or polyether and further with isocyanate compounds (col 9, lines 1+). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the alkyd industrial paints taught in Takemura as the weather resistant layer taught in Mokerji because said paints are functionally equivalent to the coating layers taught in Mokerji in that they improve the laminate's corrosion resistance.

Mokerji teaches that the weather resistant layer should be applied at a thickness that is effective to protect the underlying metallic layer and obtain the desired appearance (col 4, lines 59+), but does not explicitly teach the claimed thickness. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to vary the coating thickness in order to optimize the appearance and weather resistance of the laminate.

With respect to claim 9, the examiner takes the position that the iodine value is inherent to the polymer taught in Takemura because it comprises the same oil as utilized in the claimed invention.

With respect to claim 11, the examiner takes the position that the steel sheet has the conductive "property of a metallized film for a capacitor."

3. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-11, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita et al (US 6,376,093) in view of Nakanishi et al (US 3,914,472). Fujita teaches a polyamide film (abstract). A silicon oxide/aluminum oxide layer may be applied to the polyamide via vapor deposition, sputtering, ion plating, and the like (col 14, lines 20+). An anchor coat may be applied between the polyamide and the vapor deposition layer in order to increase the adhesion strength therebetween (col 15, lines 11+). The anchor coat preferably has a thickness of 0.01-10um (col 15, lines 51+).

Fujita does not teach that the claimed polymer may be utilized as the anchor coat. However, Nakanishi teaches that an alkyd resin could be utilized as an anchor coat between a metallized layer and a polyamide (abstract). The composition comprises 20-95wt% oil modified alkyd resins (col 2, lines 21-63). The oil-modified alkyd resin may be comprised of castor oil or palm oil (see Table 1). The laminate has good adhesion, heat resistance, chemical resistance, and weather resistance (col 2, lines 7+). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the alkyd taught in Nakanishi as the anchor coat taught in Fujita in order to improve the laminate's adhesion, heat resistance, chemical resistance, and weather resistance.

With respect to claim 11, the examiner takes the position that the steel sheet has the conductive "property of a metallized film for a capacitor."

With respect to claim 9, the examiner takes the position that the iodine value is inherent to the polymer taught in Nakanishi because it comprises the same oil as utilized in the claimed invention.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, and 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin R Kruer whose telephone number is 703-305-0025. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Thibodeau can be reached on 703-308-2367. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-5408 for regular communications and 703-305-3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

K-RK

krk
September 5, 2003



Paul Thibodeau
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700